REMARKS

Claims 1 and 15 were objected to because of informalities. Claims 1 and 15 have been amended to overcome the informalities.

Claims 1-20 are pending. Independent claims 1 and 16 were rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Ogawa (US Patent 5,608,874). Independent claim 8 was rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ogawa (US Patent 5,608,874) in view of Kremen (US Patent 5,706,434). Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections.

Independent claim 1 was rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Ogawa (US Patent # 5,608,874). Independent claim 1 requires in part providing the plurality of tables to a memory accessible by a server. However, Ogawa does not disclose providing a plurality of tables to a memory accessible by a server. Rather, Ogawa discloses loading the data into an outgoing data box. (Ogawa, Col. 10, Lns. 64-66). Independent claim 1 additionally requires sending a request, from a client to the server, to reformat the data in the plurality of tables. However, Ogawa does not disclose sending a request, from a client to the server, to reformat the data in the plurality of tables. Rather, Ogawa discloses that the uploading process is initiated by Telecommunications Software …. and receives clearance to transmit a copy. (Ogawa, Col. 11, Lns. 17-23). Independent claim 1 also requires receiving the plurality of tables at the server in response to the server receiving the request to reformat the plurality of tables. However, Ogawa does not disclose receiving a plurality of tables at a server in response to the server receiving the request to reform the plurality of tables. Rather, Ogawa discloses that the provider can either directly transmit provider data files …. or electronically mail this information. (Ogawa, Col. 11, Lns. 42-50). Independent claim 1 further requires reformatting, at the server, the data in the plurality of tables to a reformatted form according to the rules of the software application.

7

However, Ogawa does not disclose reformatting, at the server, the data in the plurality of tables to a reformatted form according to the rules of a software application. Rather, Ogawa discloses sending the data to a recipient in an intermediate format, then translating the data to a specific format needed by a particular recipient. (Ogawa, Col. 2, Lns. 57-59). Ogawa also defines the providers data format as the following: "The format of these data can be divided into general categories, including , but not limited to ASCII, ANSI X.12, EDIFACT. Binary Files" (Not reformatting into a plurality of tables). (Ogawa, Col. 8, Lns. 60 – Col 9, Ln. 3)

As a result, independent claim 1 is believed to be in allowable form and the rejections are respectfully requested to be withdrawn. Each of claims 2-7 depend from independent claim 1 and add additional limitations. Therefore, each of claims 2-7 are also believed to be in allowable form and their rejections are respectfully requested to be withdrawn.

Independent claim 8 was rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ogawa (US Patent # 5,608,874) in view of Kremen et al (US Patent # 5,706,434). Independent claim 8 requires in part receiving, at a server, a request sent via email from a client to assemble the data according to rules of a software application. However, Ogawa does not disclose receiving, at a server, a request sent via email from a client to assemble the data according to rules of a software application. Rather, Ogawa discloses that the data transmission process is invoked… via Telecommunications Software… (and) receives clearance to transmit a copy of Provider Data File (Note that our claim does not contain anything about transmitting data). (Ogawa, Col. 11, Lns. 17-23). Moreover, Kremen does not disclose receiving, at a server, a request sent via email from a client to assemble the data according to rules of a software application. Rather, Kremen discloses that a request comes in to a DOCS server from a client. (there is no mention of instructions to assemble the data according to the rules of a software

8

application). (Kremen, Col. 6-7, Lns. 66-2). Independent claim 8 additionally requires receiving, in response to the email being received, the data from a memory accessible by both the server and a client. However, Ogawa does not disclose receiving, in response to the email being received, the data from a memory accessible by both the server and a client. Rather, Ogawa discloses: transmit Provider Data Files ... or electronically mail this information. (Ogawa, Col. 11, Lns. 42-44). Moreover, Kremen does not disclose receiving, in response to the email being received, the data from a memory accessible by both the server and a client. Rather, Kremen discloses that a request comes in to a DOCS server from a client. (Kremen, Col. 6-7, Lns. 66-2). Independent claim 8 also requires assembling the data into data formatted according to the rules of the software application. However, Ogawa does not disclose assembling the data into data formatted according to the rules of the software application. Rather, Ogawa discloses sending the data to a recipient in an intermediate format, then translating the data to a specific format needed by a particular recipient. (Ogawa, Col. 2, Lns. 57-59). Ogawa also defines: The Providers Data Format as: The format of these data can be divided into general categories, including , but not limited to ASCII, ANSI X.12, EDIFACT. Binary Files ..... (This is not reformatting according to the rules of a software application. This is a different definition of the word 'Format"). (Ogawa, Col. 8, Lns. 60 – Col 9, Lns.3).

As a result, independent claim 8 is believed to be in allowable form and the rejections are respectfully requested to be withdrawn. Each of claims 9-15 depend from independent claim 8 and add additional limitations. Therefore, each of claims 9-15 are also believed to be in allowable form and their rejections are respectfully requested to be withdrawn.

Independent claim 16 was rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Ogawa (US Patent # 5,608,874). Independent claim 16 requires in part a code segment for receiving a

9

request at a server from a client to assemble data into a format that is in accord with rules of a software application. However, Ogawa does not disclose a code segment for receiving a request at a server from a client to assemble data into a format that is in accord with rules of a software application. Rather, Ogawa discloses: that the data transmission process.. is initiated ... receives clearance to transmit a copy of Provider Data Files ....(Claim 16 does not include transmitting data). (Ogawa, Col. 11, Lns. 17-23). Independent claim 16 additionally requires a code segment for receiving, in response to the request from the client to assemble the data, the data at the server. However, Ogawa does not disclose a code segment for receiving, in response to the request from the client to assemble the data, the data at the server. Rather, Ogawa discloses: transmit data files...or electronically mail this information. (Ogawa, Col. 11, Lns. 42-50). Independent claim 16 also requires a code segment for assembling the data into the format that is in accord with rules of a software application. However, Ogawa does not disclose a code segment for assembling the data into the format that is in accord with rules of a software application. Rather, Ogawa discloses: sending the data to a recipient in an intermediate format, then translating the data to a specific format needed by a particular recipient. Again, this is a different definition of the word "Format". (Ogawa, Col. 2, Lns. 58-59).

As a result, independent claim 16 is believed to be in allowable form and the rejections are respectfully requested to be withdrawn. Each of claims 17-20 depend from independent claim 16 and add additional limitations. Therefore, each of claims 17-20 are also believed to be in allowable form and their rejections are respectfully requested to be withdrawn.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 1-20 are in condition for allowance and that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. The Examiner is invited

to contact the below-listed attorney if the Examiner believes that a telephone conference is necessary.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: July 9, 2007

By: /Timothy K. Klintworth/
Timothy K. Klintworth
Registration No. 46,162

Wildman, Harrold, Allen & Dixon, LLP.
205 W. Wacker Drive
Chicago, Illinois 60606
Phone: (312) 201-2721
Fax: (312) 201-2555